



REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE (RFA) FORM INTAKE INTERVIEW LOG

Date:	11/2/17	Interviewer:	Sue Guenter-Schlesinger	RFA #17 – 67
Name of Person(s) Requesting Assistance: [REDACTED]				
Contact Numbers (telephone, e-mail, etc.): [REDACTED]				
Status of Person(s) Interviewed (title, position, student status, etc.): [REDACTED]				
Requested Assistance Pertaining To (name, position, policy, project, etc.): [REDACTED]				
[REDACTED]				

To the best of your knowledge, please fill out the following:

Interviewee Status: Male Female Administrator Faculty Staff Student
Concern Regarding: Male Female Administrator Faculty Staff Student

Category: (Please check at least one)

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age | <input type="checkbox"/> Color | <input type="checkbox"/> Creed | <input type="checkbox"/> Disability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marital Status | <input type="checkbox"/> National Origin | <input type="checkbox"/> Race | <input type="checkbox"/> Religion |
| X Sex/Gender | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Harassment | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gender Identity or Expression | | | |
- Veteran Status
□ Retaliation
□ Genetic Information

Time Line		
Date	Item	Comments
11/2/17	[REDACTED] forwards email to SGS from student [REDACTED] regarding concerns of faculty member, [REDACTED]	See email in file.
11/17/17	SGS meeting with [REDACTED]	

1/18/2018	[REDACTED] meets at EO with SGS and MS	<p>SGS explains that this meeting relates to the current issue itself, as well as being viewed in the context of past concerns (1 formal complaint and two informal issues raised). SGS reviewed the email from the student and did not mention the student's name. Specifically, SGS informed [REDACTED] about the student's concerns re: "no means no," that the student felt [REDACTED] was diminishing the issue of consent, the 'playground discussion, and that the student perceived [REDACTED] comments as legitimizing that women don't mean no when they say no – or that women don't know what they want. SGS also informed [REDACTED] that she understands this may have resulted in decreased enrollment in his courses.</p> <p>[REDACTED] said that the student's account of the conversation was "accurate, but there are important omissions" and the discussion was an "unfortunate attempt" to engage an especially quiet group of students. He described that the comments were made in the context of discussing the relativity of ethics, specifically in reference to Aristotle's <i>Ethics</i>. [REDACTED] said he thought sexual harassment would make a good example and point of discussion on Aristotle's argument that one "cannot determine ethical judgments as is." He says that he worries about people "losing sight" such that "any type of flattery or sexual attention can be misconstrued" and that it is not "as is" because the welcomeness of the flattery depends on the interest of the person receiving the comment. [REDACTED] said, "on the one hand I sympathize with the legitimate cases, it's good they're being exposed. On the other hand, I worry about people losing the concept about what constitutes sexual harassment." He thought this would be a good example for students because, "they see so much on one side, and they would need to think beyond their emotive reactions." SGS talked with [REDACTED] about the follow-up to this discussion and said that she understood that [REDACTED] had spoken with him and that [REDACTED] had been asked to apologize. [REDACTED] said that, no, he was not asked to apologize, and that he did not apologize because there was "no issue of apology because no offense was intended." He said that rather he provided an "explanatory, clarifying statement" to his students. He said that, to him, it seemed like "a great portion of the class was surprised about the need to clarify." He also said that he did not feel like the students were uncomfortable with him after this conversation as his last session of office hours was "packed with students sitting around to talk."</p> <p>Sue asked if he was aware of a connection between this issue and low enrollment in his current courses. [REDACTED] said that he believes the low enrollment is related to a conflicting, required course, not to this issue. MS asked [REDACTED] if he understood why the comments were offensive. She informed him student's may take issue with his suggestion that they "see so much on one side," relating to behavior constituting sexual harassment, but, in fact, students may feel contrarily that they see much more downplaying of issues of sexual harassment and that his statement was offensively inaccurate, and seen as an attempt to downplay an important issue. MS also explained that using a topic like sexual assault might not be the most inclusive example for an open ethical debate and not the most effective if his goal was to engage the class.</p>
2/16/18	Hailey Chittick delivers RFA Memo to Brent Carbajal, Brent Mallinckrodt, and Steven	

	VanderStaay	